

May I say in reference to my hon. friend's remark as to what took place just before six o'clock, that that is only the last act in the drama.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The worst sinner of all is the one who is at present sitting immediately behind my hon. friend and who is one of his supporters. I think he has taken up more time of the house in obstructing votes on private bills than has been taken up by all the other members put together. I am referring to my hon. friend from Toronto Northwest (Mr. Church).

Mr. BENNETT: I would not say it is quite as bad as that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I certainly think the rules of the house should be so amended that when a private bill has been fully discussed and hon. members have had ample opportunity of knowing the arguments pro and con there may be a speedy decision one way or the other.

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I desire to take exception to the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). He intimated that something disgraceful took place just before adjournment at six o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that; pardon me.

Mr. GARDINER: I merely stated to the Prime Minister when we were considering the business for this evening that I knew there were sufficient members who wished to discuss private bills now on the order paper to more than take up the hour between eight and nine o'clock. I am not going to recede one iota from the position that members must at all times have full opportunity to lay their views before the house and before the country, with respect to any measure, private or otherwise.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER: All members should have that opportunity.

Mr. GARDINER: It is true we may require some amendment of the rules. Personally I should like to see all bills come to a vote and the members of this house supporting legislation that is not in the interests of the people made responsible for their vote. I have no desire to block legislation nor do I think have any of the members who are associated with me. But, sir, if we are going to make

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

it easier for private legislation to get through this house, then I submit that when we are amending the rules we should see to it that private members are given an opportunity to introduce legislation which is required by the people, but which governments do not seem to care to introduce.

I regret the occurrence that took place, and possibly because of what has transpired during this session amendments to the rules will be made next session so that legislation will be passed, or at least the house will get an opportunity to express its opinion upon it.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) must have misunderstood me. I did not use, nor did I suggest the use of, the word "disgraceful" with reference to what has taken place; but I did say it was not consistent with the dignity of the house that private bills should not be considered because there were members who said they proposed to talk out the hour, and it would be impossible to reach a vote at this late date after we had sat several months.

Mr. GARDINER: I accept my hon. friend's explanation; it is quite satisfactory. I would say, further, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation now on the order paper has been discussed by members of all groups in this house, and I do not think it is altogether fair for my hon. friend to say that twenty or twenty-five members in this corner of the house were to blame.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say in your corner of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Private bills being exhausted the house will resolve itself into committee of supply.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Vote 519, supplementary estimates.

Post office — outside service — salaries and allowances—further amount required to hereby adjust the salaries of former permanent post office employees who were dismissed from the postal service on account of their participation in the postal strike of 1919, and who have since been re-employed and are still in the service, such adjustment to give the employees the benefit of the salary they would have received had they re-entered the service in the class equivalent to the one in which they were formerly placed, and also of the salary revisions of 1919 and 1924, in which they would